

REMARKS

Applicant submits this Amendment and Response in reply to the Official Action dated March 5, 2008. Applicant believes that the Amendment and Response is fully responsive to the Official Action for at least the reasons set forth herein.

Applicant notes that claims 1, 11, 16, 23, 24 and 26 have been amended herewith. Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify the structure of the security system. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the user interface device, the transmitter and the control are integrated in a security system keypad. Claims 11 and 16 have been amended to recite the steps of generating a wireless enable signal at the user interface, the wireless enable signal is encoded with the retrieved identifier, transmitting the wireless enable signal to a security system control panel, and transmitting a wireless activation signal from the security system control panel, the wireless activation signal is encoded with the retrieved identifier. Claims 23, 24 and 26 have been amended to correct an editorial error. Applicant submits new claim 27 for examination. Claim 27 is directed to an electronic tag that periodically wakes up to checks for a wireless signal.

No new matter has been added to the application by way of the aforementioned amendments. For example, Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to pages 5-12. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims (including new claim 27) are patentable over the cited references, whether taken alone or in any combination thereof.

Notably, Stilp discloses a security system with an object locator feature with a keypad for controlling the system and locator feature. In Stilp the keypad sends a signal to an **RF reader** to interrogate the RF transponder. Each RF reader is in wireless communication with the RF transponders. Stilp teaches that a controller function is to communicate with the RF readers.

In Stilp, the controller does not communicate with the RF transponder or a control panel (to instruct the control panel to communicate with an RF transponder). Stilp teaches the use of a RF reader as an intermediary for communication.

Claim 1 recites that the control causes the transmitter to transmit a wireless signal. The control and transmitter are located within a security system keypad.

The claimed invention incorporates the locator feature into an existing **security system** without a need for the RF reader. The advantage of the present invention is that the locator feature uses existing wireless communication components and existing transmitting and receiving protocols of the control panel and/or user interface device of the security system. In the claimed invention, the only additional items needed are the tags.

Since, Stilp teaches using the RF readers, there is no suggestion to incorporate the claimed control, transmitter and user input, into a security system keypad.

Additionally, there is no suggestion to generate a wireless enable signal at the user interface, transmit the wireless enable signal to a **security system control panel**, and transmit a wireless activation signal from the **security system control panel**, as recited in claims 11 and 16.

Furthermore, Stilp fails to teach a receiver for receiving a wireless signal encoded with an identifier that was retrieved by a security system keypad, as recited claim 22.

Additionally, Stilp clearly describes a RF reader as a separate device from a control panel. Accordingly, Stilp does not teach that security system keypad includes user interface device, a memory and first control section and that a security system control panel includes a second control section and a transmitter, as recited in claim 25. The RF reader is neither the user interface device nor a security system control panel.

Applicant submits that Crabtree fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that Wesby fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies.

Notably, Wesby does not suggest that it is obvious to incorporate the claimed structure and function into a security system keypad and control panel in a home or business security system.

Wesby teaches a remote asset monitoring and control system. Each asset is associated with a wireless module. The wireless modules can communicate directly with each other using one or more existing wireless protocols. Alternatively, the wireless modules communicate with each other using an asset interface module as a gateway.

Wesby does not suggest using a “security system keypad” or a “control panel” as the wireless module, i.e., user interface or control. Wesby describes several examples of the wireless module. For example, the wireless module can be a PDA or a mobile telephone device. The wireless module also can be integrated into an in vehicle GPS system. The wireless module also has the capability to be integrated into a utilities meter. Additionally, each wireless module comprises the capability to communicate with a mobile telecommunications infrastructure.

The wireless module is specifically designed for longer-range asset management and location. The wireless module is particularly effective when the asset is remotely located from the wireless module, e.g., another city or state. Tellingly, the location method uses GPS data. If the wireless modules were intended for in home usage, i.e., finding glass or a TV remote, GPS data would most likely not be used. Wesby describes that in the area of **remote** facilities management, the remote asset management system provides a solution for an improved fire alarm and home security network for communicating directly with the homeowner or directly

with emergency services. The remote facilities management implies that the homeowner is not within the home or premise when receiving the notice.

Additionally, Wesby does not differentiate between the wireless modules used for user input and wireless modules used for identify the location. At best, the wireless modules is an "identification tag" and not the user input or keypad.

Applicant submits that the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references based upon the above-identified analysis.

Additionally, while Crabtree purportedly teaches polling tags, Crabtree does not teach an electronic tag that periodically wakes up to check for a wireless signal, as recited in new claim 27.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-4, and 6-26 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow new claim 27.

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicits the Examiner to allow the application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of this application, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,


Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No: 30,749

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
PJE:SW:reg